DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 034 EA 029 897

AUTHOR Kozleski, Elizabeth B.

TITLE The Educational Renewal Agenda: A Synthesis of Our Evaluation Findings.

PUB DATE 1999-04-00

NOTE 33p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; Educational Assessment; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; *Partnerships in Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation

IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the progress of the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (CoPER), an initiative that increases contact and dialogue between universities and P-12 faculty. The report provides a history of Colorado's foundation for the school-university partnership, which was established in 1986, and discusses a long-range evaluation of CoPER. It focuses on partner-school practices and outcomes, detailing a valuative approach called the portraiture process, in which eight partner school faculties--two high schools, two middle schools, and four elementary schools--agreed to be evaluated. The schools provided logs that documented all partner-related activities, supplied written surveys completed by all stakeholders, and took part in focus group interviews. The evaluation results are presented under the four functions of partner schools: exemplary education for all students, teacher preparation, continued professional development, and inquiry. The report considers the emerging effect of partnering on college faculty, particularly on teacher education. The paper also examines students' standardized test scores to measure the impact of CoPER, looks at the benchmarks that have been established for the program, summarizes data collected from individual interviews with members of education leaders, and details the shared meaning of simultaneous renewal. An appendix contains a list of CoPER benchmarks. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 034

Elizabeth B. Kozleski, Associate Professor
University of Colorado at Denver
Director, National Institute for
Urban School Improvement
1444 Wazee, Suite 135
Denver, CO 802020
ekozleski@ceo.cudenver.edu
tel: 303-620-4074
fax: 303-620-4588

PAGE 1

The Educational Renewal Agenda: A synthesis of our evaluation findings

A paper prepared for
American Educational Research Association
Annual Meeting
Montreal, Canada
Session 6.40, April 19, 1999[1]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. Kozleski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

INTRODUCTION

In Colorado, six higher education institutions and 13 school districts have collaborated to establish more than 50 partner schools across the state through the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (CoPER). The Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal (CoPER) is a member of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). The NNER, founded by John I. Goodlad, is a national organization of schools and colleges/universities whose participants strive to simultaneously improve schools and the preparation of new teachers, working toward conditions outlined in John Goodlad's book, Educational Renewal[2]. Much of the work of educational renewal occurs at the partner school sites, where preservice teachers learn from and with practicing teachers, and where the university faculty and students become a part of the learning culture at the school site. It is critical for the reader to understand that these relationships represent a carefully conceptualized but fledgling strategy to ensure that both the partners (the public school and IHE) engage in their own ongoing renewal and program improvement as well as contributing to the renewal and improvement work of their partner.

The concept of educational renewal is based on some assumptions about how P-12 public schools and institutions that prepare teachers might influence each other's cycles of growth and improvement as they work in tandem on the preparation of new teachers and the schooling of P-12 students. The first of these assumptions is that teacher preparation will improve as teaching theory and practice are negotiated on a day-to-day basis in P-12 schools and as teacher candidates are in close contact both with university and school site faculty. Second, increased contact and dialogue among school site faculty, teacher candidates and university faculty will promote the continued professional development of both faculties. Third, the connections between the faculties will result in increased and shared reflection and inquiry about teaching

---

[1] *This paper was presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting in Montreal, Canada in April 1999 as part of a symposium entitled "University/School District Partnerships from Multiple Perspectives: A Statewide View." The symposium presented the work of the team evaluating the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal. Along with Kozleski, other members of the team are Donna Cooner, Ann Foster, Cori Mantle-Bromley, Beverly A. Parsons and Carol Wilson. From year to year, different graduate students assisted in the work of the team.*

[2] Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational Renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA029897

and learning. As a result, the learning experiences for the P-12 students and preservice teachers in these partner schools will be enhanced. Ultimately, as a result of all these activities occurring simultaneously, students in both public schools and preservice programs will be able to learn in rich, culturally diverse, democratic school communities that value intellectual pursuits, knowledge generation and exploration, caring and civil discourse, and the development of moral principles.

CoPER addresses the NNER educational renewal mission through three strands of work: (1) support of partner schools, (2) support of centers of pedagogy, and (3) attention to critical issues related to educational renewal. With CoPER's support, universities and school districts wrestle with the complex organizational and human factors that make partnerships across institutional boundaries both challenging and rewarding.

In this paper, we report on CoPER's progress from multiple perspectives. A history of the partnership provides a context for its development and its current membership. A synthesis of the data that were collected across eight portraitures provides a look into the very different contexts of partner schools. An overview of the impact of partner school activity on the P-12 students who attend the partner schools provides a barometer of the effects of partner school activity on students. In conclusion, we discuss the implications of these data, highlight promising practices, and make recommendations for continued study and evaluation of this rapidly evolving enterprise called the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal.

A HISTORY OF THE PARTNERSHIP

Colorado's foundation for the school-university partnership concept began to develop in 1983 when Cal Frazier invited John Goodlad to the state. The goal was to create school-university clusters to address particular themes/issues, similar to John Goodlad's League of Cooperating Schools. As with all of Dr. Goodlad's work, the point was to have inquiring educators creating renewing schools that provide excellent education for all students.

In 1985, Dr. Goodlad formed the Center for Educational Renewal (CER) at the University of Washington. Through the CER, he launched a comprehensive school-university partnership initiative focused on renewing schooling and the education of educators, which led to the creation of the National Network for Educational Renewal (NNER). Because of Dr. Goodlad's prior association with Colorado, he invited interested superintendents and deans to form a formal school-university partnership and apply for membership in the NNER.

After numerous meetings and discussions, leaders of seven school districts and two institutions of higher education formed the Colorado Partnership for Educational Renewal in 1986. The Partnership became an initial member of the NNER, which now includes 16 settings in 12 states. Its mission was, and remains, the simultaneous renewal of schooling and the education of educators. This mission is grounded in an understanding of the responsibilities inherent in schooling in and for a democracy. The Partnership's work, along with that of other settings in the NNER, promotes the renewal of schools and teacher education programs so they support educators in

- becoming skilled in and using teaching practices that help all students learn

(nurturing pedagogy);

- providing real access to knowledge for all students;
- becoming stewards of our schools; and
- enculturating the young into our social and political democracy.

From its inception, the Colorado Partnership has cultivated the development of partner schools as a significant avenue towards simultaneous renewal. Although this goal was elusive in the beginning, the strategy of taking smaller steps, accomplishing tasks together, cultivating relationships, and working for the good of the whole is showing results. Table 1 provides an overview of the Partnership's development from 1986 through the 1997-98 academic year. As a chart it cannot convey the extent of the partners' commitment and work that has brought us to this point. Hopefully, it does convey a sense of the groundwork that has been laid to create a supportive context in which partner schools and expanded educational renewal will continue and flourish.

Table 1: A brief timeline of CoPER Activities from Inception through 1997

Formation & Early Stages 1986-88	Challenges of Collaboration 1988-90	Expanding the Partnership 1990-93	Addressing Simultaneous Renewal 1993-97
FOUNDING PARTNERS: -Adams Co.1 (Margaret Carpenter) -Adams Co.12 (James Mitchell) -Boulder Valley (James Hagar) -Cherry Creek Schools (Richard Koeppe) -Denver Public Schools (James Scamman) -Englewood Schools (Roscoe Davidson) -St. Vrain School (Keith Blue) -MSCD (Charles Branch) -UCD (William Grady)	**PARTNERS:** -Adams Co.12 -Boulder Valley -Cherry creek Schools -Denver Public Schools -Englewood Schools -MSCD -UCB -UCD -(CDE, ex-officio member)	**PARTNERS:** -Adams Co. 12 -Boulder Valley -CCCOES -Cherry Creek Schools -CSU -Denver Public Schools -Douglas Co. Schls (90-93) -Englewood Schools -MSCD -UCB -UCD -UNC ('92) Weld 1 Schools -(CDE, ex-officio member)	**PARTNERS:** -Adams Co. 12 -Adams Co. 14 -Boulder Valley -Cherry Creek Schools -CSU -CDE (ex-officio member) -Denver Public Schools -Jefferson Co. Schools -Mesa Co. Valley Schools -MSC -MSCD -Poudre Schools -St. Vrain Schools ('94-95) -Thompson Schools -UCB -UCD -UNC -Weld 1 Schools -Weld 6 (Greeley-Evans)
BOARD CHAIR: Roscoe Davidson	**BOARD CHAIR:** Roscoe Davidson	**BOARD CHAIR:** Phil DiStefano	**BOARD CHAIR:** Phil DiStefano (til '96); Roscoe Davidson
STAFF: Richard Kraft (acting executive director 1/86-7/86) Lance Wright (executive director part-time 7/86-1/88)	**STAFF:** Exec. Dir., Carol Wilson; admin. Assist. Jeanna Finch.	**STAFF:** Exec. Dir., Carol Wilson; admin. Assist. Dorothy Templeton/Pam Kilwein; Math Proj. director, Linda Damon	**STAFF:** Exec. Dr Carol Wilson; Assoc. Dir. Bonnie Walfers ('94); Prog. Coord. Elizabeth Parmelee ('94); Admin. Asst. Yvonne Castenada ('95) G.A. Ruben Chacon ('96); Sr. Assoc.: Dean Damon, Vivian Elliott, Cal Frazier
SAMPLE ACTIVITIES: Work groups on Administrative Leadership; Research & Eval; Teacher Ed (later Educ. & Training of Professionals); Youth-at-Risk; The Common Curriculum (later Curriculum & Instruction); Conferences, e.g., Educ. Renewal-Myths & Perspectives (J. Goodlad, A. Shanker, Vito Perrone)	**SAMPLE ACTIVITIES:** Work Groups; Project TIME (math reform); conferences, including with Jeannie Oakes, Lew Rhodes, John Goodlad; Multi-Cultural Resource Team; Gender Equity	**SAMPLE ACTIVITIES:** Work groups; conferences with Mortimer Adler, John Goodlad, Ted Sizer, Lorrie Shepard; Colo. Dialogue on Reform of Teacher Educ., partic. In IEI Ldshp. Prog. • Filed for 501 © 3, August, '89; • Action Group formed 1990 • Reconstitution of NNER; MSCD asked by Gov. Board to represent	**SAMPLE ACTIVITIES:** Dev. Partner schl benchmarks; criteria & process for funding partner schls; partner schl principals group; summer inst; curriculum direcs/standards; Teacher Leadership Initiative; Partners for Parity; critical issues work; centers of pedagogy; Socratic Seminars;

Formation & Early Stages 1986-88	Challenges of Collaboration 1988-90	Expanding the Partnership 1990-93	Addressing Simultaneous Renewal 1993-97
		CoPER in NNER; ('92); '93 return to full CoPer representation in NNER	evaluation initiative; partic. in IEI Leadership Assoc. Prog.
FOCI: Begging the leadership & school renewal issues	**FOCI:** Continued emphasis on school renewal; building momentum for simultaneous renewal; Initial criteria for partner schools developed. (see *Perspectives*; Summer, 89)	**FOCI:** Continued emphasis on school renewal; building momentum for simultaneous renewal.	**FOCI:** Creating the conditions for simultaneous renewal, with a view toward equal and excellent education for all students. Cultivating understanding of educators' role in schooling in/for a democracy.
ISSUES: How to have a partnership of equals b/n schools & ... How to show short-term accomplishments while moving toward long-term goals	**ISSUES:** How to move beyond the focus on school renewal. How to begin building institutional commitment for the simultaneous renewal agenda.	**ISSUES:** How to cultivate common understandings of the agenda and commitment to the collective momentum for simultaneous renewal. **GRANTS:** CCCOES for Gender Equity; USDOE for CPMP, math proj. from Project TIME; Colo. Endowment for the Humanities (Soc. Sem./Cherrelyn Elem. & Fairview H.S.)	**ISSUES:** * How to clarify what we mean by partner schools; & centers of pedagogy, especially with potential policy implications. Clarify individual and collective roles. **GRANTS:** American Council of Learned Societies; CCCOES; Goals 2000 (4); National Eisenhower Prof. Dev.; DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest (2)

PARTNER SCHOOL PRACTICES AND OUTCOMES

"What comes first, good schools or good teacher education programs? The answer is that both must come together (Goodlad, 1994[3])."

By the end of the second year of a three-year evaluation cycle, eight partner schools had been studied. There were three identified purposes for partner schools evaluation. First, evaluation helped us to understand ways in which partner school relationships in general and the CoPER specifically affect the work of its participants in university teacher preparation programs (including teacher candidates and university faculty in education and in arts and sciences) and in the partner schools (including teachers and students). Second, the evaluation process facilitated partner school participants' reflection on the progress they were making toward the NNER's four functions of partner schoolwork. Third, evaluation assisted the CoPER in improving its support of members' educational renewal efforts.

We called our methodology portraiture because we wanted partner schools who engaged in the process to understand that our evaluation would result in a snapshot of their work within a specific timeframe, much like a photographer shooting a photograph. A photograph is a representation of a particular place at a particular moment. The aperture of the lens, the angle that the photographer shoots from, the time of day, and the available artificial and natural lighting are some of the many variables that shape the final image. In the end, any photograph likely omits far more than it reveals but it remains an artifact of what was. So too, it is with our portraitures.

---

[3] Goodlad, J. (1994). *Educational Renewal.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

It is important to note that program models and terminology vary considerably across institutions of higher education (IHEs). We used the term partner school to refer to those sites where IHE and public schools have entered into a long-term relationship to prepare new teachers, engage in professional development, provide exemplary education and conduct research and inquiry.

THE PORTRAITURE PROCESS

The eight partner school faculties volunteered/agreed to participate in the evaluation process. Two high schools, two middle schools, and four elementary schools participated. The eight participating schools worked in partnership with varying universities but all of the organizations belonged to CoPER. In the school portraitures developed by the CoPER evaluation team, it was noted that partner activities functioned within a wide range of structures. Each Institution of Higher Education (IHE) had specific program procedures and worked with varied preservice teacher populations. For example, some programs were post-baccalaureate while others only offered undergraduate programs. Numbers of preservice teachers ranged considerably from institution to institution (range = 100 graduates per year to 1200 per year), as did the structures of the schools of education (from faculty of 36 to faculty of 70). The teacher preparation programs represented a variety of types of higher education institutions with varying missions for teaching, research and community service. Some programs were in undergraduate institutions; others were in doctoral degree granting universities. Additionally, the public school districts vary widely in size, geographically and in populations served. The P-12 schools represented five different district; one large urban, three suburban and one smaller city districts were involved in the evaluation study. However, at the heart of the partner activities is the agreed commitment to the NNER mission of educational renewal of public and higher education through the four partner school functions.

The portraitures had three purposes:

1. To provide the partner school participants with an understanding of how the partner school work is viewed and experienced from differing vantage points,
2. To provide readers with an understanding of the impact of the partner school relationships and activities on its participants, and
3. To provide evidence of the partner school's progress toward the four functions of a partner school, as defined by the National Network of Educational Renewal (NNER).

Data were collected throughout the year that the partner school was studied and were gathered using the following tools:

1. An activities log, documenting all partner-related activities,
2. Written surveys, completed by P-12 students, school faculty and administrators; preservice teachers, and university faculty, and
3. Focus group interviews, including P-12 students, P-12 faculty, school administrators, classified staff, families, preservice teachers, and university faculty.

In the first year of portraitures, classroom observations were also used.

EVIDENCE OF THE FOUR FUNCTIONS

The four functions of partner schools (exemplary education for all students, teacher preparation, continued professional development, and inquiry) are seen as interlocking features of a renewal process that engages both P-12 schools and universities in a simultaneous journey focused on exemplary education. The following information, compiled from an analysis of each function across the sites, presents a brief view of progress being made as a result of partner school work. The findings reported here represent either trends that emerged across all partner schools or, the majority of experience in the partner schools that we studied. It is important to emphasize that the schools are at very different places in their partner school evolution. Time, resources, and the contexts that exist internally for the various partners influence the strength and outcomes for each partner school. However, our intention in this evaluation was not to compare sites against one another but rather to analyze the individual portraitures for emerging cross-site trends. As is evident from the following discussion, function two, teacher preparation, is flourishing in most partner schools. Professional development activities are occurring in increasing numbers as a result of the partner school collaborations but they remain loosely linked to the notion of inquiry as a form of both teacher preparation and professional development. Exemplary education for all, function one, is more difficult to link to the impact of the various partner school relationships since P-12 schools continue to implement other innovations in response to state and district opportunities and mandates. The next section explores these four functions in more detail.

FUNCTION 1: EXEMPLARY EDUCATION FOR ALL

> *Two characteristics help to define this function. The first is that partners communicate in such a way as to create a learning community. The second is that partners seek equity and excellence for all enrolled students and other members of the learning community.*

Communication between adults (preservice and regular teachers) in the building and P-12 students was generally viewed positively. Communication between IHE faculty and students seemed less evident (across the buildings) probably as a result of the time spent by IHE faculty in the building where they work. There were varied results in response to questions about the communication between IHE faculty and preservice teachers. For instance, in one partner school, more than a quarter of the preservice teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that there was good communication between preservice teachers and IHE faculty. Yet, in another partner school, all 25 preservice teachers in the building agreed or strongly agreed that the communication between themselves and their IHE faculty was good. Variables that may affect this finding include the partner school model being used as well as the way that individual IHE faculty carry out their roles in partner schools.

Parents and other family members who participated in focus groups in four of the eight sites reported that they believed that the partner school model improved instruction for their own students. Additionally, classified staff who participated in focus groups also indicated that they felt that the partner school site benefited from the infusion of preservice teachers in the classrooms. Interestingly, in at least three of the partner schools, preservice teachers indicated that they did not have much opportunity to interact with family members.

Lack of sustained IHE presence at partner sites was identified as a barrier to communication (in

three of the eight partner school studied) and therefore to collaborative efforts. While mutual respect was developed, continual difficulties with scheduling time in buildings, attending meetings and distance from the site were reported resulting in frustration on the part of IHE and P-12 faculty as well as preservice teachers.

IHE faculty data indicated they were spending as much time as possible at the partner site and felt that good relationships within the school existed. An unexpected side effect was noted at one IHE; effective communication at the partner site reduced communication with colleagues at the university.

An additional area of concern arose in sustaining the partner activities once initial meetings, training and other activities were completed and established activities were underway. There was the perception in some sites that one partner (either IHE or school) initiated most of the conversation and activities and the other was the recipient, raising the question of equal effort and commitment to the partnership.

EQUITY AND EXCELLENCE FOR ALL

Most P-12 students in the eight partner schools studied agreed that they were treated fairly. However, when asked if all students were treated fairly, the percentage of those who agreed decreased in at least six of the schools that were studied.

Two of the eight schools in this study were center programs for their districts' special education programs. They served students with low incidence disabilities who were clustered at one school so that the district could provide specialized services and personnel without having to travel to multiple sites to do so. In both cases, faculties and administrators reported that preservice teacher candidates and P-12 students benefited from the opportunities to interact academically and socially with student who learned in diverse ways. Typical of the comments heard was this one:

- *One of the reasons that this partner school is such a good site for us is because of its commitment to including special education kids. So it's a good model for our students to see, in terms of that commitment to including the kids. And, we have used a variety of different co-requisite courses for field placement, but there is always that underlying rationale about the inclusion of the special education population.*

In terms of shared decision-making, P-12 faculty at most of the sites felt that they were included in decisions that were made at their sites. P-12 students at several sites also felt as if they were engaged in meaningful student government activities. However, it is unclear from the data that were collected that the degree to which equity and excellence is experienced by P-12 students at these sites is due in any part to the partner school status. Cases in point are the two center partner schools. These schools were center schools for students with low incidence disabilities before they became partner schools. Hence, the benefits cited because of the presence of students with disabilities existed before the partner school was undertaken.

On the other hand, curricular innovations have been initiated in some of the partner schools as a direct result of the partnership between the IHE and the P-12 school. For instance, one elementary school entered into its relationship with its IHE partner in order to focus on its

science curriculum. And since the advent of the partner school relationship, students have improved their science performance on standardized achievement tests. In a couple of sites, P-12 teachers have worked with liberal arts and sciences faculty at IHEs to improve curriculum and instruction in a middle or high school content area.

SUMMARY

The impact of the partnership on exemplary practices is not uniformly deep (across all members) or consistent (across all sites). P-12 faculty and administrators assume that their programs and services will benefit from more consistent and sustained relationships with schools and colleges of education and liberal arts and sciences. The evidence, at this point, suggests that some benefit accrues to the P-12 school as a result of the partner school effort:

1. ***Teachers are perceived as caring and competent.*** Students perceive that the majority of their teachers (both regular and preservice) are caring and competent.

2. ***P-12 students report that all students may not be respected.*** Most students believe that they are respected but some question whether all students in the schools are respected.

3. ***Partner school work invigorates the teaching conversations in P-12 schools.*** A large majority of faculty (P-12 and university), students, classified staff, families, and preservice teachers report that the partner school relationship brought an infusion of new ideas and teaching strategies into the classroom. As one teacher stated, "*We stimulate each other to provide the best instruction we can to our students.*"

4. ***In spite of the extra time and energy spent on sustaining partner relationships, being a partner school was perceived as beneficial by all members of the partner schools.*** There was agreement among the stakeholder groups that being a partner school was beneficial, although it required additional time and attention.

5. ***Communication emerged as an essential feature of improving practices.*** At least six of the partner schools in this evaluation reported that inquiry activities, co planning, advisory committees, co-teaching and social activities contributed to the development of community between the partner school site and its IHE partner. Further, where sustained IHE presence at partner sites was not implemented, teachers and principals identified that as a barrier to communication and therefore to collaborative efforts.

FUNCTION 2: TEACHER PREPARATION

There are three indicators that can be used to measure progress in this function. First, all members of the partnership engage in continuous collaboration to ensure that the partner school is an integral part of the total preparation program. Second, the partner school helps preservice teachers to construct the pedagogical skills, curriculum knowledge, and attitudes necessary to educate all learners. Third, the partners demonstrate knowledge of relevant academic disciplines from arts and sciences.

Data from focus groups and surveys reveal that this function of the partner school is best understood and implemented. While areas of improvement remain, particularly in relationship to

the involvement of liberal arts and sciences faculty at the IHEs, this is a strong and vigorous element of each of the partner schools. In this report, six areas are highlighted:

1. ***The importance of authentic setting***. Preservice teachers in particular remarked in several focus groups across the eight schools that they were able to apply knowledge and skills from their coursework almost immediately into the classrooms where they worked.

2. ***The importance of long-term continuity of experience***. The P-12 faculties frequently mentioned their belief that long-term experiences improved the preparation of preservice teachers. They felt that the preservice teachers received a much broader base of experience, including developing a sense of the rhythm and flow of a school year and an entire school staff, rather than one teacher and one classroom. One site's faculty described their relationships with preservice teachers as being more professional, another faculty discussed increased trust that developed over time, and another spoke of the support that could be provided over time.

3. ***The gap that sometimes occurs between theory and practice***. Preservice teachers at two of the eight sites described the gaps that they sometimes saw between theory that they learned in their IHE courses and practice they observed in the partner schools. At four of the sites that were studied, preservice teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they were able to make connections between theory and practice.

6. ***Preservice teachers are welcomed in classrooms.*** In general, P-12 students appreciated and enjoyed the presence of preservice teachers in their classrooms. They felt as if they got more personalized attention, more than one approach to understanding a new procedure, and P-12 students commented on the enthusiasm of the preservice teachers. As older P-12 students reflected on the experience of having preservice teachers in their classes, they made more specific comments on how the school might orient and support the preservice teachers to make them even more effective.

4. ***The need for more joint planning time***. While there is general positive support for the preservice function, the sentiment from the focus groups, supported by the survey data, is that more joint planning time is needed. IHE and P-12 faculty need more time together to understand and support classroom activities. Preservice teachers want and need more time with both their IHE and P-12 faculty to reflect on their teaching performance.

7. ***Preservice teachers add to the quality of the learning experience in partner schools.*** P-12 students and adult groups believe that the preservice teachers have improved the quality of P-12 students' schooling experiences.

8. ***More work needs to be done to integrate preservice teachers into the cycle of the school year.*** Preservice teachers need to be introduced and integrated into the classroom and the school from the beginning of their experience. Some students and classroom teachers expressed the notion that preservice teachers are not adequately absorbed into the culture of the building.

FUNCTION 3: CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Hallmarks of professional development in a partner school include four elements: (1) professional development for educators is collaboratively defined and based on the needs of students; (2) professional development links theory, research and practice; (3) professional development helps professionals work with special needs students; and (4) professional development helps educators understand how professionals from various fields can best work together.

The partnership literature defines professional development not merely as a set of activities but as patterned ways of operating that raise the stakes for collaboration, theory/practice integration, and improvement of teaching practices for students whose learning needs may require intensive instructional scaffolding and support. While the survey data suggest that professional development occurs as a result of the partner school relationship, the focus group data reveal that the range and variety of professional development models do not yet match the partnership vision. Examples of the kinds of professional development activities that occur include increased dialogue about teaching and learning among the three key groups: preservice teachers, P-12 faculty and IHE faculty. Study participants report that preservice teachers provide new ideas and resources and serve as a catalyst for improving the practice of the P-12 faculty. The IHE faculty mentioned that they were able to stay current in their understanding of students and schools because of their involvement in the partner school.

Survey data points to increased learning as a result of the partner school relationships on the part of P-12 faculty and the preservice teachers. Learning is perceived to have happened, to a lesser extent, for the IHE faculty.

At some sites, less than half of the surveyed P-12 faculty report that they have been involved in peer observations, participated in university coursework, or had opportunities to model new instructional techniques in the classroom. Yet, at other sites, faculty report high levels of coursework participation (as much as 100% of the faculty at one site) and two-thirds of the faculty report engaging in peer observations. The focus group data also suggest that the Arts and Sciences IHE faculty involvement is minimal but emerging.

In summary the data from our work suggests that the first and second hallmarks of professional development are emerging. That is, professional development in the partner schools is at least collegial, if not collaborative in some sites and ranges to being co-planned and facilitated by P-12 and IHE faculty. Further, the tensions between theory and practice are being explored by teacher candidates and the partner school faculties.

FUNCTION 4: CONDUCTING INQUIRY INTO EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

The NNER defines the components of this function in three parts. First, partners engage in critical social inquiry concerning school and teacher practices. By emphasizing the word "social", the component takes on a very particular meaning. That is, schools are crucibles of socialization. Their practices, sorting procedures, discipline plans, and yearly goals, to name a few examples, are reflections of the values and beliefs of the members of the school community. By engaging in critical social inquiry, these practices and many others are examined to ensure that equity and access for all students is achieved in the organizational and classroom structures

and practices.

A second component of inquiry highlights the importance of reflective practice as a means of generating continuous improvement of education in the partner school. Finally, partners use the partner school as a setting for scholarly examination of professional practice.

Inquiry within the eight partner school sites is less visible than the other three functions and hence more difficult to measure. It is also the arena in which teachers and administrators are less comfortable since it is not structured into the school organization. Yet, if schools are to continue to be renewed and developed, inquiry in classrooms must occur[4]. In this analysis, research and inquiry was defined broadly[5]. Through surveys, participants were asked whether or not they engaged in reflective practice, informal evaluation, action research, formal research and Socratic seminars. The results across sites indicated that preservice teachers most frequently engaged in reflective practice and action research. The P-12 faculty reported themselves as being most involved in reflective practice, informal evaluation and Socratic seminars. Faculty at the secondary level reported higher levels of participation in formal research than did elementary faculty. The number of IHE faculty reporting involvement in action and formal research was much less than those reporting involvement in reflective practice, informal evaluation, and Socratic seminars.

Over the eight sites, the following trends were found:

1. The majority of inquiry is in the form of reflective practice which many participants felt was increasing as a result of being in a partner school relationship.

2. Demands of pressing everyday activities constrain the amount of time that people feel they can devote to inquiry.

3. School faculty may view inquiry more as the role and responsibility of the university faculty than as their own role.

4. In sites where there is an explicit focus on inquiry, preservice teachers were aware of the importance of critical reflection on their teaching practice.

5. Inquiry is not a regularity of school life.

---

[4] Elmore, R. F. (1996). Getting to scale with good educational practice. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*, 1-26. Osguthorpe, R. T., Harris, R., C., Harris, M., Fox, Black, S. (1995). Partner Schools, Centers for Educational Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Sarason, S. B. (1993). The Case for Change: Rethinking the preparation of educators. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. Sirotnik, K. A. (1987). *The school as the center of change*. Paper presented for Restructuring Schooling for quality Education: A new reform agenda. San Antonio, TX.

[5] Using Sirotnik's (1987) definition of inquiry, the evaluation team looked for evidence that the partner school members were asking questions about practice such as: (a) is this the way that we want things to be?; (b) what information and knowledge do we have (or need to get) that bear upon the issues?; and (c) what are we going to do?

SUMMARY

IHE and public school educators focus primarily on the immediate work of developing their partner school relationships. The context in which this work occurs, i.e., under the aegis of CoPER, is for the most part, very distant from the daily lives of these educators. Survey data showed that preservice, P-12 and IHE faculty all reported some degree of confusion about the connection between partner school activities and CoPER. Site liaison logs from the eight portraitures provide evidence that the number of partnership activities that occur across the partner schools vary widely. One school reported only 13 activities over the course of an entire school year that were partnership related. Another school reported as many as 72 activities that engaged either the whole school community or members of the community in one of the four functions of partner school. In some of the partner schools, the site liaison logs show that university faculty attend most, if not, all of the partner school activities. In a few other situations, the P-12 faculty participates but there is little evidence that the university partner faculty engages actively and continually in the partner school activities.

In most cases, P-12 faculty may develop a strong and durable relationship with one or two university faculty. Except in one case, the P-12 school sites do not interact with more than four or five university faculty. P-12 faculty and administrators report feeling a lack of time with their university faculty. They want to see the faculty in their schools more than once a week, even when that faculty person may spend an entire day per week at the school. Where faculty are less visible (i.e., visits three times or fewer per month), the P-12 faculty don't experience much opportunity to collaborate or explore new kinds of relationships.

Partner schools experience varying levels of support from their partner IHEs in part because of the varying roles that partner schools play in the preservice preparation programs of the various institutions. In two IHEs, preservice teacher preparation occurs almost exclusively in conjunction with designated partner schools. At these two institutions, some final student teaching occurs at sites outside their partner school sites simply because of placement availability. At the other three institutions, the partner school preparation model is one of several different approaches to preservice teacher preparation. IHE faculty in the various education programs may be asked to assume leadership or at least be involved in more than one model. As a result of the need to attend to varying types of student need, program implementation, and faculty workload, IHE faculty in multiple model institutions may not benefit from the concept of educational renewal. For example, in the two unitary model institutions, faculty report changing their program curricula as a result of their interaction with P-12 faculty. P-12 partner school sites report changes in their governance structures to account for more involvement with their partner IHEs. Shared inquiry among the P-12 faculty and the IHE faculty partners also seems to be emerging more strongly in the unitary models.

Our data also show that in the partner school sites associated with these multiple model institutions, there is less mentoring of preservice teachers in the partner school sites by IHE faculty than in the unitary partner school program model. For instance, a quarter of the IHE faculty and approximately the same amount of preservice teachers in the multi-model approach reported a mentoring interaction about once a week. Another quarter of the faculty and 12% of the preservice teachers reported mentoring interactions about once every two weeks. Four out of 26 preservice teachers at one multi-model partner school reported that they had never been mentored by an IHE faculty.

On the other hand, even at school sites that are partners with the multi-model preservice programs, preservice teacher candidates report satisfaction with their preparation experiences. Thus, while the educational renewal agenda may not flourish at these schools, preservice preparation still appears to be satisfactory. The reasons for this satisfaction on the part of preservice teachers lies in great due to the relationships that preservice teachers are able to develop with their teacher mentors.

Faculty from both IHEs and P-12 schools feel positive about the professional development opportunities provided by CoPER. In particular, the annual summer institute and the Teacher Leadership Academy are mentioned as beneficial professional development activities.

The following list outlines the kinds of questions that partner schools may want to explore with all their partners as they move forward in their relationships:

1. Are IHE communications among departments and schools sufficient to promote content and pedagogical improvement in the partner efforts?

2. How do communication efforts work across institutions and within institutions?

3. How are key partners identified and communication sustained over time?

4. Who needs to be part of the conversations around IHE promotion and tenure policies that can support partner site activities?

5. How is effectiveness of classroom management techniques taught to preservice teachers measured? Are adjustments made for different populations that will be served by the preservice teachers?

6. What kinds of opportunities do preservice teachers have to converse with higher education and school faculty on classroom issues?

7. Rigorous content knowledge is important to successful preservice experiences. How are support and congruence issues addressed between arts and sciences and education faculty members?

8. What kinds of planning/activities are effective in establishing collaborative efforts? Who are key participants from the partner institutions? How can responsibility be shared across institutions for sustaining efforts around substantial issues

Emerging Effects of Partnering on IHE Practices

Not all IHE faculty who prepare teachers are connected to a specific partner school, yet their work in teacher preparation has an impact on the preservice teachers in their respective institutions. These faculty are themselves influenced and impacted by the various roles that their institutions play in partner schools. It seemed critical to understand the impact of the educational renewal agenda on their professional lives. To do this the evaluation team distributed open-

ended questions in hard copy to each participating IHE and also, in some cases, sent an email copy of this questionnaire to individual faculty. A total of 23 surveys were returned. The largest number (n=10) came from CSU; the smallest number of returned surveys was from Metro (n=2). Because of the unequal numbers across the various participating institutions, the data do not necessarily accurately depict the breadth of experiences at each institution. The represented institutions included the University of Colorado at Boulder and at Denver, the University of Northern Colorado, the Metropolitan State College, and Colorado State University. Data were analyzed across institutions rather than within. Respondents noted that partner school involvement was only one of several mandates that had influenced changes in teacher preparation. Other influences that were mentioned included diversity, PLACE exams, an emphasis on technology, changing standards in state and professional accrediting organizations, and faculty participation in professional conferences.

In general, faculty across the institutions agreed that partner school involvement had affected the preparation of new teachers. Faculty found that preservice teachers had more experience in the field as a result of the partner school model and that preservice teachers were able to determine how good the fit was between the role of teacher and their own personal qualities. There were many reports that IHE curriculum (content and sequence) and required products had changed as a result of investment in partner schools. Another frequently mentioned feature of partner school involvement was that courses were offered more frequently on public school campuses and that P-12 faculty were assuming more and more teaching responsibilities in these courses. Several faculty mentioned that a sense of community was developing among faculty, preservice teachers, and P-12 students. IHE faculty feel increasing pressure to involve P-12 students and faculty in their classes, are spending more time in the schools and are more aware of school issues and teacher licensure issues.

Faculty commented on the impact of the partner school model on their own professional growth. They noted that collaboration among liberal arts and sciences and education had increased. They also noted that collaboration between IHE faculty and P-12 faculty had supported their own learning and skill development. Faculty noted improvements in their own teaching, their engagement in reflective practice, and the changes in how they approach research and inquiry as a result of partner school activities.

In general, the faculty who responded to this questionnaire appeared to have made important changes in their approach to pedagogy and research as a result of their involvement in partner schools. However, the low number of respondents makes these data only suggestive rather than definitive.

A Look at Student Standardized Test Scores

During interviews with the Evaluation Team, various Governing Board members spoke of how critical it is that CoPER members document and measure the impact of collaborative work. Board members primarily focused their discussion of measurement on their desired ultimate outcome of collaborative work: improved student achievement. This school administrator's statement demonstrates a common level of concern regarding expected outcomes:

> *All of us right now in this state I think are very focused on student achievement, very focused on results. And if we can't show that the partnership, in any area that they're working in, is making a difference to what happens in the classroom, and that is higher achievement, I don't think we're going to exist.*

An IHE administrator echoed the concern:

> *Now that we're in schools, so what? What has that done? And how has it increased student achievement? That is the bottom line . . . . That's where the struggle is right now with the partnership—being able to prove it's value-added to the overall goal of schooling.*

Although all board members felt strongly about the need to measure progress and impact, several board members urged that data other than student achievement data be considered relevant. One board member felt that interviews with participants was appropriate in determining the effect of the partnership on their practice. Another felt that employment data of beginning teachers would be important to examine. The following board members' comments demonstrate a belief that CoPER members should maintain a broad perspective when evaluating their work.

- *How are people doing once they get hired? What is different about the student's experience in a partner school)?*
- *Hopefully over time we'd collect some comparative data showing that kids that are involved in these kinds of settings do in fact have broader experiences, greater depth . . . not only in the more measurable kinds of achievement but in terms of . . . interests, in terms of commitment to schooling and in terms of levels of engagement.*

District administrators reported immediate pressure from their primary stakeholders (parents and board members) to demonstrate that the money and time spent in partnership endeavors were beneficial to children. Governing board members agreed that careful measurement of progress was critical to sustaining efforts and resources.

As a result of this concern in particular, the evaluation team undertook the task of collecting available achievement test score data for partner schools for the past five years. Using standardized, group-administered achievement scores to measure the impact of partner school work on student learning is problematic. Merely comparing aggregated student test scores across years and looking for evidence of change in those scores is a curious task. So many variables impact a school in any given year that connecting partner school work to gains or losses in student achievement data is at best a limited relationship. Leadership and staff changes ultimately effect school outcomes far more strongly than the partner school linkage. There are a variety of other changes that can potentially alter school performance such as changes in the local economy, demographic changes in the community, the adoption of new curriculum or textbooks, teacher changes, the numbers of students at any grade level.

Perhaps, in a relatively stable school, over an extended period of time (say 5 to 7 year relationship), where high quality implementation has occurred, it would be likely that some trends would be noticeable. This hypothesis is consistent with the school reform and renewal literature in general where high quality implementation of reforms such as Accelerated Schools

has demonstrated improvements in student performance as measured by standardized test scores only after five to seven years of implementation work.[6]

Given all these caveats, the evaluation team collected and looked at reading achievement test data from 11 partner schools. Table 2 on the following page tabulates those data by school. The buildings are grouped by the year that they entered the partnership, beginning with the '93-'94 school year. Each school is identified by a pseudonym. The four schools who have been in the partnership the longest, show varying patterns of achievement across five years of data. At Falcon Elementary, third grade achievement scores declined from year 1 to year 2, rose in year 3, declined in year 4 and declined further in year 5. However, at the same school, fifth grade reading scores rose across the years from the 26th percentile in year 1 to the 42nd percentile in year 5. Grackle Elementary third grade reading scores declined from year 1 to year 2, rose slightly in year 3 and then rose again in year 4. In year five the scores declined in third grade. Yet, fifth grade scores, like those at Birdsong, rose over the five year time span from the 34th percentile to the 42nd percentile. At Raven Elementary, the reading achievement scores have been relatively stable with some decline in years 3 to 5. At Albatross Elementary, scores decreased in year 3 but rose again in years 4 and 5.

What these variations in reading achievement scores mean and what events contributed to them is difficult to determine simply by eyeballing the data. In order to use the standardized test scores in meaningful ways, a much more powerful statistical approach needs to be applied to the data. This would require tracking multiple variables at each school and looking at the influence of each variable on student scores. Most likely, a nested approach to the data would be useful since individual student, classroom and school-wide factors all contribute to the results. In addition, some type of comparison would need to be made with other non-partner schools across the same sets of variables.

Another partner school used a specific index to measure the impact of its partner school relationship. This partner school has emphasized science in the last few years. The participants at the partner site have indicated that student CAT and math scores have gone up since the partnership activities. The CAT/5 aggregate science score for this school's students was at the 76th percentile as compared to the 57th percentile in 1996, the 74th percentile in 1997, and 17% higher than the district 1998 mean science score at the 65th percentile. The partner school's social studies score was at the 73rd percentile in 1998. This compares favorably to the 56th percentile achieved in 1996, the year before they became a partner school and the 71st percentile in 1997, the first year of their partnership. This year's 73rd percentile was also 14% higher than the district average of 64. As positive as these data are, without controls, it remains problematic to attribute these gains to partner school work.

---

[6] Levine, H. (1997). Research in accelerated schools: Classrooms and schools. Chicago, IL: American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting.

Table 2: Achievement Test Scores for 11 Partner Schools

Partner School: (All Elementaries)	Partner since:	Test(s) used:	Grade(s) Tested:	Scores: '93-'94	'94-'95	'95-'96	'96-'97	'97-'98
Albatross	1994	CTBS[a]	5th	*50	50	43	45	53
Falcon	1994	ITBS[b]	3rd	21	19	24	22	18
			5th	26	24	24	39	42
Grackle	1994	ITBS	3rd	24	19	21	33	30
			5th	34	36	30	39	42
Raven	1994	CTBS	5th	56	56	53	55	53
Nightingale	1996	CAT[c] ('93-	5th	51%	63%	62%	64%	61%
		CTBS ('97-						
BlueJay	1996	MEAP	5th	64%	72%	46%	63%	47%
Cardinal	1996	ITBS	6th	N/A	N/A	66	75	76
Canary	1996	[d]MEAP	5th	82%	87%	73%	87%	78%
Chickadee	1996	MEAP	5th	71%	77%	76%	70%	76%
Goldfinch	1997	ITBS	3rd	41	38	64	46	49
			5th	60	51	58	51	55
Lark	1997	ITBS	3rd	N/A	44	36	52	52
			5th	45	50	47	54	53

[a]CTBS (Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills): Scores represent mean scores, percentages represent the % of students scoring above the national 50th percentile

[b]ITBS (Iowa Test of Basic Skills): Scores represent mean scores for the grade

[c]CAT (California Achievement Test): Percentages represent the % of students scoring above the national 50th percentile

[d]MEAP (Michigan Educational Assessment Program): Percentages represent the % of students meeting the district standard

*Shaded areas represent the years that the school belonged to the partnership

SUMMARY

Using standardized achievement test scores to measure benefit from partner school work must be done using high fidelity, scientifically valid methodologies. Merely looking at scores before and after partner school inception has little scientific merit. The amount and type of data needed will require more time and effort from school and central administrations to collect the information required.

ARE THE COPER BENCHMARKS PRESENT?

While participants in partner schools need to embrace both continued improvement of practice and professional preparation, how they do this varies widely, depending on the individuals, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

political and financial context and organizations involved. In 1996, CoPER established benchmarks for all members of partner schools to better understand and fulfill their roles, organize their inquiry, and mark progress toward schools that successfully integrate the four functions of partner schools.

The benchmarks are organized by the following levels: District, IHE, school site, IHE faculty, school professional, principal, P-12 student, and preservice teacher. Analysis of data from portraitures revealed the glaring omission of a set of benchmarks that relate to the role of families and parents. This is particularly troublesome since family members and parents had so much to offer in terms of their participation in focus groups held at school sites. The lack of articulation among roles within the key players in partner schools affect the breadth and spread of partner school functions throughout districts. Some of the data also suggest that lack of attention to the partner school function within IHE hierarchies may hinder the involvement of Arts and Sciences faculty in preparing preservice teachers through a partner school model. Finally, there is little evidence that partner school members use the benchmarks to guide their own renewal and recommitment to the partner school model.

Some of the data from the governing board highlight these issues. Three themes dominated board members' discussion of their roles within the educational renewal framework: providing support, communicating their vision, and helping to remove system barriers to collaborative work.

PROVIDING SUPPORT

Both school district and IHE administrators spoke of their roles in supporting collaborative efforts. Resources, specifically time and money, were seen as critical to successful partner school collaboration. Additionally, administrators saw the need to develop and sustain relationships, particularly at executive and policy-making levels, that could facilitate collaborative work.

COMMUNICATING THE VISION

Board members described the importance of increasing the level of understanding of the collaborative work (its purpose, its relevance) to their respective stakeholders and personnel. Board members described the ongoing need to maintain focus, energy, and interest in collaborative efforts.

REDUCING BARRIERS

Both IHE and district administrators saw as their role removing system constraints that impede the work of educational renewal. IHE administrators primarily spoke of the need to align faculty reward systems with partner schoolwork. They also saw a need to ensure recognition for those who are furthering the goals of the partnership.

District administrators, on the other hand, described the need to broaden the educational renewal efforts across their districts. The benefits of collaboration, they felt, needed to be more equitably distributed. In order to achieve this, they needed to increase the numbers of partner schools in their districts and to encourage participation in partnership functions beyond that of partner

school personnel. They also needed to be involved in creating new structures and new opportunities for their constituents.

PROGRESS ON THE SIMULTANEOUS RENEWAL AGENDA

This section summarizes data collected from individual interviews with members of CoPER's Governing Board. The Governing Board comprises twenty school superintendents (or their designated representatives), six deans or directors of member schools/colleges of education (or their representatives), two assistant deans of colleges of arts and sciences, and two executive officers of CoPER. District-level board members represent rural, suburban, and inner-city districts. Higher education members represent research universities and 4-year liberal arts colleges. Board members serve as representatives of their institutions and therefore see that they are on the board partly to further the interests of their respective institutions. Eleven board members were involved in individual interviews that formed the basis of this analysis.

SIMULTANEOUS RENEWAL: WHAT IS IT?

When asked what educational renewal meant to them, board members' responses ranged from a one sentence statement to a ten-minute explanation. Members were consistently asked for examples and were asked to clarify those aspects of their responses that seemed vague.

A shared definition seemed to emerge from the interviews that included concepts present in all board members' explanations of educational renewal and some concepts that were present in at least six of the twelve members interviewed:

> *Simultaneous renewal is like a two-sided coin. On one side, simultaneous renewal is a blueprint for facilitating a seamless process of collaboration across school and higher education institutional boundaries. The other side of the same coin presents simultaneous renewal as an outcome of those collaborative activities which 1) reflect inconsistencies, 2) provide ongoing professional development of its participants, and 3) lead to improved teaching and learning for both P-12 and higher education students.*

WHAT DOES THE DEFINITION MEAN?

Simultaneous renewal, according to this definition, is both an organizational strategy, chosen among many potential strategies, and also a result (but not the ultimate goal) of that strategy. The purpose of the strategy is to facilitate the development of collaborative relationships between the personnel of schools and of institutions of higher education (IHEs). These relationships, according to district and IHE leaders, provide the impetus for adjustment to participants' professional beliefs and behaviors. Like a stone tossed into a pond, the collaboration across institutions can bring into question those practices taken for granted, can break up internal consistencies of both school and IHE personnel's' beliefs and practices. A recognition of inconsistency, like the ripples extending outward from where the stone entered the water, nudges the participant into an examination of previously unquestioned belief or practice, potentially leading to an adjustment in practice. The ongoing nature of collaboration provides a mechanism for constant feedback and correction, potentially leading to ongoing improvement of teaching and learning for IHE and school students. As stones continue to be tossed into the

pond, the pond itself is changed.

ADDITIONAL CONCEPTS FOR CONSIDERATION

Some concepts which were stressed in particular governing board members' explanations of simultaneous renewal but were not mentioned in at least half of the interviews included the following, listed in descending order of frequency of appearance:

- The collaboration should incorporate an ever-expanding group of participants. The work cannot be seen as an exclusive, elitist activity nor can it benefit only those directly involved in partner schools
- Teaching should improve, in part, in areas of agreed-upon values (e.g., equal access to knowledge, preparation for democratic participation).
- The collaborative relationships should result in changes in roles.
- The relationships resulting from collaboration must be non-hierarchical.
- The collaboration should increase experiential learning.
- The collaboration should lead to increased trust across institutional boundaries and also to a breakdown of the "we/they" perspective.
- The collaboration should lead to a breakdown of institutional barriers (i.e., reward structures).
- Inquiry into practice should become ongoing and habitual.
- Institutions should more fully commit to the simultaneous renewal strategy.

Expansion on the concept of *collaboration* included descriptions of joint activities such as teaching, dialogue, reflection on practice, inquiry into practice, decision making, and implementation of jointly-made decisions.

Expansion on the concept of *professional development* included that which was imbedded into daily work, was meaningful, and ultimately led to refinement of practice.

CURRENT STATUS OF COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS

Governing board members reported that they saw some progress in the simultaneous renewal agenda. The progress, according to both district and IHE administrators, primarily has been limited to those directly participating in partner school relationships. This limited impact is inherently problematic for district administrators who see value for two or three schools but none or little for the remaining 100+ schools in their districts.

AREAS OF PROGRESS

Progress toward improvement in teaching and learning, resulting from collaborative efforts, was

reported in numerous areas, reported in order of descending frequency of occurrence in the interview data.

- New teachers are better-prepared than they were prior to the partner school efforts.
- Numerous collaborative efforts are underway (joint conversations, faculty interchange, etc.).
- A set of agreed-upon values and principles is emerging.
- Trust across institutional boundaries is increasing.
- More educators are critically examining their practice.
- Participants are beginning to accept some responsibility for their counterparts' student outcomes.

LIMITATIONS TO SIMULTANEOUS RENEWAL AS A STRATEGY FOR EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT

Although governing board members saw some progress in the simultaneous renewal agenda, they were quick to point out that advancement has been limited. Board members described many barriers to the simultaneous renewal strategy. Those reported below were mentioned at least twice. Again, they are reported in order of descending frequency of occurrence in the interview data.

- There is great variation in both understanding of and commitment to the simultaneous renewal/educational improvement agenda. School and IHE education faculty who are not involved in partner schools tend to be uninformed. This is also true for arts and sciences faculty in higher education institutions and for the public in general.
- There is too little activity in non-partner schools for school administrators to see district-level impact.
- We do not yet know how to measure progress in a way that will demonstrate the value of collaborative work to various stakeholders (i.e., parents and board members).
- Scarce resources limit the potential impact of collaborative work. Time, money, and energy were the resources most frequently mentioned.
- The variation in partner school models, across the IHEs, makes it difficult to determine which models are most effective.
- Reward structures (at both the IHE and the district level) do not support collaboration.
- Change in leadership, either at the administrative or the implementation level, can be problematic. Some relationships may be too fragile to withstand changes in personalities.
- Institutions have maintained traditional boundaries; they remain separate entities with

separate agendas.

- It is problematic when the commitment to the agenda is greater at the district level (or specifically at the partner school) than at the partner IHE.

One interviewee expressed the concern that the majority of collaborative effort is focused on improving schools and that rarely is the focus on improving teaching and learning at the IHE level. Although this is only one board member's concern, it may parallel a concern of imbalance raised by some teachers during partner school evaluations. Teachers at one site felt that most labor in the collaborative endeavors was provided by school rather than IHE personnel.

The following summary comments can be made, based on data analysis:

- CoPER governing board members share numerous concepts in their explanations of simultaneous renewal.
- Board members see substantial progress being made in the educational renewal agenda, but it is limited to those sites participating directly in partner school relationships.
- Board members believe that careful measurement of progress and impact is critical to collaborative efforts.
- Board members see their roles within the simultaneous renewal framework as providing support, communicating vision, and reducing barriers that impede the work.
- Board members see their work on the CoPER governing board as a continuation of their work within their individual institutions. Some members see a role of learning and others see a role of seeking balance between IHE and district focus and participation.
- Membership in CoPER is seen as a way to facilitate and support collaborative efforts of individual institutions and as a way to provide professional development opportunities to educators.

PROMISING PRACTICES

Using the simultaneous renewal of schools and teacher education programs as the broad lens, and a partner school's four functions as a more specific filter, the evaluation team extracted the following promising practices from data collected during the first two years of studying CoPER partner schools sites.

GETTING STARTED

In partner schools where substantive conversations and study took place in the initial stages of partner school discussion, faculty from both the IHE and the partner school site began their work together with a better understanding of the four functions of partner schools. Faculty were also better prepared to initiate good working relationships. While taking the time to study and understand the partner school model meant delays in implementing "formal" partnership

activities, the investment of time and thought resulted in shared beliefs, good working relationships, and preventative maintenance. Emerging from such activities were tangible focal points for the partner activities. Examples include focus on the role of democracy in schooling as it applied to day-to-day activities, work on improving student performance in specific content areas, integrating at-risk students into the school, and professional development in a specific content area.

These are some of the practices that seem to launch durable and sustaining relationships:

- Developing a shared purpose based on the partner school functions;
- Having discussions that result in agreements that all groups see as adding value to their work;
- Taking time to explore the issues and possible problems with the entire staff;
- Developing the possibilities with the whole staff.

MAINTENANCE AND GROWTH

Partner sites that collected information from self-study, the evaluation process or other data sources found that resources could be used differently to better meet the needs of P-12 students. Through the portraitures, it also became apparent that involving all members of the school community (including parents, p-12 students, and classified staff) in discussions about the partnership resulted in support from all groups. Additionally, sites learned that different groups view the activities in relationship to their own roles, and this sometimes caused confusion or uncertainty. For instance, in one school, uniformed classified staff began to worry that the preservice teachers might replace them and thus, they would lose their jobs.

To a large degree, preservice teachers were more successful and comfortable in buildings where a whole school plan was in place to welcome, orient, and integrate them into the building. Examples of effective strategies included nameplates on classroom doors, mailboxes assigned to preservice teachers, Polaroid photos of preservice teachers with their names hung above the photocopy machine, and introducing preservice teachers to P-12 students and explaining their roles.

Schools have saturation points for successful integration of preservice teachers. Agreements on the number of preservice teachers to assign in a building help to maintain manageable numbers of preservice teachers. More than one preservice teacher per classroom was problematic for teachers. Students and parents raised concerns about having too many student teachers per classroom.

Using preservice teachers wisely both for their own professional growth and for optimum benefit to the P-12 school takes forethought and ongoing planning on the part of mentor teachers. Effective, long-term relationships occur when preservice teachers are engaged in meaningful activities such as tutoring or working with small groups of students for whom they have responsibility for planning activities. Observing, correcting papers, and other clerical tasks should be shared responsibilities between the mentor teacher and his or her preservice teacher. Time and timing were factors in successful accommodation of a large number of preservice teachers. Data indicated that when preservice teachers were in their assigned buildings on consecutive days, they were able to develop more helpful relationships and more coherent experiences. Other time factors included starting preservice teachers at the beginning of the

school calendar year, and being in the same school for more than one semester.

Mentor teachers need time and opportunity to work with their IHE counterparts. Collaboration on the preservice teacher curriculum helps to ensure that what preservice teachers experience in the classroom provides the kinds of skills development in exemplary practices that result in improved learning outcomes for the P-12 students. IHE and P-12 faculty need time to co-teach and co-supervise so that they become more integrated into each others' responsibilities and develop closer working relationships. Participating together and debriefing a feedback conversation with a preservice teacher can help both faculty members develop their coaching and mentoring schools. Offering courses on such skills as coaching and mentoring can help to expand the number of faculty who feel comfortable and effective mentoring.

Each partner school needs leadership for all four functions. The leadership should come from both the IHE and the P-12 faculty. Activities that occur in each building should be planned with an eye to balancing the attention to the four functions. An emphasis in the initial stages on preservice education should be strategically reallocated across the four functions within the first two years. As activities occur, they should be explicitly linked to the four functions to continue to increase the whole school's awareness. School improvement goals could use the four functions as a way of organizing strategies to reach those goals. As an example, where a building's goal might be to increase the literacy performance of its students, the school improvement team might ask what will we do to develop exemplary practice, to engage in professional development, to involve our faculty in inquiry around this issue and to capitalize on our preservice program. Objectives and activities could be developed from this framework.

Finally, some evidence exists that suggests that where partner schools focus their partner work on a particular content area, the time and energy used to initiate and maintain the partnership translates more quickly into improved results for P-12 students.

To maintain each partner school, there are some promising practices:

- Individual mentoring by IHE liberal arts and sciences faculty with individual P-12 faculty called "mini-sabbaticals".
- Efforts contributing to quality communication included inquiry activities, co planning, advisory committees, co-teaching and social activities.
- Involvement in IHE preservice teacher preparation curriculum design by P-12 faculty.
- Gestures and procedures that bring preservice teachers into the building as respected and accepted faculty are important.
- Time considerations for quality preservice teacher experiences include adhering to the school calendar, being in one school for an extended period of time, and being on site on consecutive days.
- The number of preservice teachers placed at a site must not overtax the faculty Agreement on an appropriate number is essential. Planning activities to match their level of training is also important; the idea is to engage the preservice teacher meaningfully.

- Include the whole school community in the partner school initiatives. Educate parents, and classified staff as well as the professional and preservice audience on the partner school purpose and activities and seek their feedback.

SUSTAINABILITY

Successful partner schools develop through the initial state and begin to maintain and grow through genuine democratic processes. Including all community groups in discussions and decisions results in refinement and initiatives that enhance experiences for P-12 students. Including P-12 students as participants in the partner schools is a key learning emerging from the CoPER evaluation process. Highly developed working relationships and mutual respect are indicators of quality partner schools. These indicators are evident in a variety of activities and operating principles.

Students are a rich source of information for improving preservice teachers' work. When students are asked to provide feedback to preservice teachers, they offered insightful suggestions. This practice expands the notion of critical reflection. Where preservice teachers and P-12 and IHE faculty engage in planned and non-evaluative reflective practice, professional growth occurs for all. Adding student's perceptions to this key component elevates learning and strengthens democracy in school practices.

The interaction among professionals in the partner school program is vastly different from the traditional student teaching model. Teachers and preservice teachers work as co-teachers, providing expanded learning opportunities for students while improving their teaching skills. Where university professors, public school teachers, and preservice teachers all engage in teaching, observing, and providing feedback, simultaneous renewal at the IHE and P-12 school site occurs. Expanding the role of teaching to include the P-12 students as well as the adults benefits all.

Mentoring impressionable and motivated preservice teachers is a serious responsibility. Mentoring classes for teachers who work with preservice teachers increases skills and improves the experience for the teachers and preservice teachers.

Clear philosophical understanding of the four functions of partner schools and the intent of the simultaneous renewal are essential for successful long-term partner school programs. All faculty at the university, whether or not directly involved in partner schools, must support the concepts just as commitment at the partner school site is needed. Understanding and support for the philosophy and a value of the work create a consistent program across sites. Organizational considerations should meet the unique needs of the site, but varying levels of support for the basic partner school principles result in inconsistent experiences for the preservice teachers and varying expectations between public school teachers and university faculty.

In summary:

- Students are valuable resources for improving preservice teachers' work.
- The traditional student teaching model does not operate in partner school settings, rather teachers and preservice teachers work cooperatively learning from and with one another.

- Expanding the teaching role for all participants is key to simultaneous renewal and building mutual respect among adults in the partner school.
- Formal training for teachers as mentors is useful.
- Philosophical support and commitment from both P-12 and university faculty are essential for sustaining meaningful partner activities.
- The development and ongoing use of building leadership teams that include representatives from IHE and P-12 faculties, preservice teachers, P-12 students, administrators, and family members.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ACROSS THE COPER

The following recommendations were seen as critical to work that encourages simultaneous educational renewal of districts and institutions of higher education. Our recommendations have come from several sources including interviews with governing board members, open ended surveys from IHE faculty, individual portraitures of partner schools and student achievement data. Included with each practice is an example of work that would fit within the stated category and a possible extension of the category.

1. CoPER should continue to sponsor activities that extend, broaden, and deepen understanding of and commitment toward the agenda of excellence and equity. Evidence from a variety of sources suggests that the individuals who have been engaged in many of these activities continue to influence the shape and development of partner schools. The extent to which this influence is felt will depend on the number of individuals who understand and are committed to exemplary educational practices for all.

2. The Summer Institute is an activity of broad representation that also deepens participants' understandings and commitment. Governing board, IHE and P-12 faculty all mentioned the Summer Institute as a important opportunity to connect, build relationships and develop a better understanding of the simultaneous renewal strategy.

3. There may be need for an annual orientation that explains CoPER and the simultaneous educational renewal agenda to new personnel hired into leadership positions within CoPER's membership.

4. CoPER and individual members should focus on careful and constant measurement of the effect of collaborative efforts on participants. The three-year evaluation (of which this report is part) is an important first step. Efforts need to be spent determining the impact of collaboration on students. This may need to be done at the individual IHE level since partner school models vary significantly. Efforts to communicate the purpose and benefit of collaborative work to various stakeholders are important.

5. Parents and school board members need to be involved in the partner school work in

meaningful ways so that the public is informed and involved in helping to shape the implementation and use of partner schools across districts.

6. District or IHE representatives see their partner institution's CoPER participation as an indicator of the partner's commitment to their collaborative work. Issues of non-participation may need to be discussed openly by participants.

1. The data on renewal at the IHEs, beyond faculty who are involved integrally in the partnership itself, is sketchy. There is a need to identify the outcomes that are expected and then design a data collection process that targets those outcomes.

2. After studying eight different partner school sites, it is evident that there is great variation in how partner schools are being implemented. CoPER needs to engage all its members in a discussion about how different implementation sites can be and still remain exemplars of educational renewal in progress?

3. While many of the functions of the partner school model have been implemented to varying degrees, it is not yet clear about the extent to which the varying partner schools have explicitly dealt with issues of equity for all P-12 students. This notion of equity cannot be separated from the first function of the partner schools: Exemplary education for all. More emphasis on equity needs to occur in all aspects of CoPER from the governing board through individual partner schools.

WHAT NEEDS TO COME NEXT:

- A focus on student outcomes for preservice and P-12 students
- An analysis of how teacher candidates from partner schools fare in their first years of teaching as compared with traditionally prepared teacher candidates
- The dissemination of a tool kit for each partner school to engage in its own evaluation
- The exploration of the cost-effectiveness of the partner school model
- The identification of best practices within partner schools

Appendix A
CoPER Benchmarks

THE COLORADO PARTNERSHIP CRITICAL ATTRIBUTES FOR PARTNER SCHOOLS

Elizabeth B. Kozleski

William Munsell

Carol Wilson

DISTRICT ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ Partner Schools are a central strategy for renewal and improvement of all schools in a participating district; as such, districts use their partner schools to assist other schools to improve practice.
- ✓ Current reform efforts (Colorado Standards, National Goals 2000, school professional licensure standards) are all intertwined with school professional preparation and ongoing development.
- ✓ Through formal agreements, school boards identify their district's partner schools as vehicles for professional development and renewal of curriculum.
- ✓ The partnership reflects a strong commitment to collaborative staffing decisions and cross-institutional communication.
- ✓ Partnership agreements are supported by district personnel policies and master agreements with certified and classified employee associations.
- ✓ A structure of formative and summative evaluation exists which addresses development of the partnership.
- ✓ All members of the partnership communicate in such a way as to create a learning community.

UNIVERSITY/COLLEGE ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ Administration at IHEs use partner schools as a central strategy for strengthening and promoting the role of Schools of Education as collaborators in supporting the renewal and improvement of education in their local communities.
- ✓ The teacher education program of the IHE is continually and systematically renewed through collaboration with public school educators in the partner school.
- ✓ School professional preparation programs at IHEs are integrally connected to partner schools through joint resource and FTE commitments on the part of IHE's and school districts.
- ✓ Governance structures at both the IHE and the partner school reflect shared decision making through membership on their respective operating committees.
- ✓ The retention, promotion, and tenure policies at participating IHEs value, recognize and support the academic merit of products created by faculty as a result of their partner school activities.
- ✓ Preparation programs in partner schools assure that school professionals develop the pedagogical skills needed to educate all children.
- ✓ All members of the partner school program communicate in such a way as to create a learning community.

SCHOOL SITE ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ Partner schools as a whole (school accountability teams, school professionals, faculty from IHE's, ad hoc committees, classified staff, and students) recognize and meaningfully integrate the preparation of school professionals into their annual school improvement planning and implementation cycles.
- ✓ Partner schools serve all students in the community in which they are situated, including students with the most significant disabilities, students who speak other languages, teen parents and other, potentially marginalized populations.

- ✓ The partner school is continually and systemically renewed through collaboration with the teacher education program of the IHE.
- ✓ Partner schools design their regular programs and special initiatives so they are integrated and coherent.
- ✓ The mission of each partner school is revisited frequently and evolves as partner schools come to understand their roles in the changing context of their communities.
- ✓ Partner schools collaborate with other health and human service agencies, employee associations, community businesses and agencies, and families to meet the needs of their constituents.
- ✓ Preparation programs in partner schools assure that school professional develop the pedagogical skills needed to educate all children.
- ✓ A process, developed jointly by the partners, is in place at the school to ensure that the partners measure student academic progress and satisfaction and develop appropriate strategies to respond to and communicate the findings.
- ✓ Student performance is measured in a variety of ways.
- ✓ Information about student performance is shared with families, faculty, staff and community members so that these key players understand the implications of the data.
- ✓ School professionals, families, faculty from IHEs and administrators use data from student performance as a weathervane for school improvement.
- ✓ Inquiry in partner schools is directly related to solving the difficult problems of practice in schools.
- ✓ All members of the partner school program communicate in such a way as to create a learning community.

UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGE FACULTY ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ Faculty communicate effectively with colleagues, families, students and the broader community.
- ✓ IHE faculty in partner schools are engaged in critical inquiry to improve instruction and curriculum.
- ✓ IHE faculty spends at least one day per week in a partner school with course equivalency and/or other consideration negotiated with the IHE.
- ✓ The IHE faculty person provides leadership in the development of an annual plan to implement effectively the 4 functions of a partner school.
- ✓ Students, school professionals, families, and faculty from IHEs engage collaboratively in inquiry.
- ✓ IHE faculty engage in continued professional renewal.
- ✓ IHE faculty are fully qualified in their content areas, have experience with K-12 students, and are current in their teaching and assessment practices.
- ✓ Faculty from IHEs assume shared responsibility for teaching students in partner schools.
- ✓
- ✓ Faculty from IHEs foster the use of themselves as resources, not only in their discipline expertise, but as general problem solvers and extra pairs of hands.
- ✓ Faculty from all disciplines at IHEs are involved in school professional preparation.

SCHOOL PROFESSIONAL ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ At least one school professional in each partner school assumes leadership for implementing partner school functions. (e.g., coaching and mentoring, scheduling, materials acquisition, study groups).
- ✓ Curriculum and instruction in partner schools are grounded for teaching and learning in a social and political democracy.
- ✓ Students, school professionals, families, and faculty from IHEs engage collaboratively in inquiry to

improve instruction and curriculum.

- ✓ School professionals are fully qualified in their content areas, have classroom experience, and are open to learning.
- ✓ Partner school professionals are continually engaged in professional development both individually and collectively.
- ✓ Students are actively engaged in providing feedback to school professionals about their practices.
- ✓ Teachers model, guide and support students in exploring and practicing democratic ideals in a school committed to being a model of democracy.
- ✓ Long-term relationships between school professional candidates and their mentors are established at the beginning of their preparation programs and expanded upon over the course of the preparation so that the experience culminates in a junior faculty relationship.

PRINCIPAL ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ Principals support students, school professionals, families, and faculty from IHEs who engage collaboratively in inquiry.
- ✓ Principals assure that the whole school and its community recognize and meaningfully integrate the preparation of school professionals into their school improvement cycles.
- ✓ Principals assure that the responsibilities of the partner school are met.
- ✓ Principals focus their school staff and community on the 4 functions of partner schools.
- ✓ Principals ensure that student learning is positively affected by partnership activities.
- ✓ Principals work toward establishing a faculty that is uniformly supportive of the functions of a partner school.
- ✓ Principals are active and regular participants in external and internal partner school functions.
- ✓ In collaboration with the IHE, the principals work with existing staff in development of best instructional practices.
- ✓ The principals facilitate an atmosphere of collaboration and sharing among all parties involved in the partner school effort.

STUDENT ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ A process, developed jointly by the partners, is in place at the school to ensure that the partners measure student academic progress and satisfaction and develop appropriate strategies to respond to and communicate the findings.
- ✓ Student performance and well-being is enhanced by virtue of their participation in the efforts of the partner school relationship.
- ✓ Student at the partner school consider themselves partners in the school renewal effort. They are aware of the partner school program and understand the roles played by the partners.
- ✓ Students explore and practice democratic ideals in a school committed to being a model of democracy.

TEACHER CANDIDATE ATTRIBUTES

- ✓ Teacher candidates actively participate in a broad variety of the activities of the partner school.
- ✓ Teacher candidates communicate positively and effectively with the partners in identifying strategies to enhance their own professional development as well as support the school renewal effort.
- ✓ Teacher candidates provide appropriate student instruction in cooperation with their clinical instructors, partner school staff and the IHE faculty.

- ✓ Teacher candidates serve as partners in the school renewal effort by introducing and modeling new and appropriate instructional strategies/technologies.
- ✓ Teacher candidates act as positive, caring role models for their students and the student body of the partner school.
- ✓ Teacher candidates model, guide and support students in exploring and practicing democratic ideals in a school committed to being a model of democracy.